



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,567	12/26/2000	Edmund J. Mozeleski	99B065/2	6491

7590 08/26/2003  
ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, TX 77522-2149

EXAMINER

OH, TAYLOR V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/750,567

Applicant(s)

MOZELESKI ET AL.

Examiner

Taylor Victor Oh

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Final Rejection***

**The Status of Claims**

Claims 1-36 are pending.

Claims 1-36 have been rejected.

**Claim Rejections-35 USC 112**

1. Applicants' argument filed 6/13/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The rejection of claims 1-2 has been maintained due to the failure to modify in the amendment.

Claims 7-10, 15, 18, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for THF and methyl tert-butyl ether as examples of an ether, does not reasonably provide enablement for all the ethers. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to include all the ethers unrelated to the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specification, while being enabling for ethylene, propylene, isoolefins, butanes, and C<sub>5</sub> to C<sub>18</sub> olefins as examples of an olefin, does not reasonably provide enablement for all the olefins. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to include all the olefins unrelated to the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1625

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation.

Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation, citing *Ex Parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art,
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

In the instant case, the claims encompass countless esters obtained from the reaction of the starting materials containing any olefin or any ether. However, applicants' specification provide the only 22 particular exemplified olefins or ether compounds from the claimed method. Thus, the examples herein have failed to provide sufficient working examples to support the production of possible hundreds of esters. Therefore, an appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15, 18, and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "contacting an olefin or ether" is unspecific and complicated; there are two different inventions in each claim. Each one should be rewritten in a such a way to produce the claim which describes only one reactant; for example, contacting an olefin with carbon dioxide. Furthermore, the examiner recommends the incorporation of limitations of either claim 3 or claim 5 into the corresponding claims. In addition, the examiner recommends the incorporation of limitation of claim 19 into the claims 1 and 36.

#### **Claim Rejections-35 USC 103**

2. The rejection of Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung et al (U.S. 4,311,851) in view of Takahashi et al (U.S. 4,894,188) has been withdrawn due to applicants' convincing argument.

The rejection of Claims 24-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al (U.S. 4,894,188) in view of Jung et al (U.S. 4,311,851) has been withdrawn due to applicants' convincing argument.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. Victor Oh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

Art Unit: 1625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman , can be reached on (703) 308-4698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

T. Victor Oh

*Victor Oh*  
*8/25/03*

*Alan L. Rotman*

ALAN L. ROTMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600